



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

MAR 19 2009

Marc E. Elias, Esq.  
Perkins Coie  
607 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, #800  
Washington, DC 20005

RE: MUR 5854  
The Lantern Project  
and Brian Donlen, as treasurer

Dear Mr. Elias:

On October 26, 2006, the Federal Election Commission notified your clients, The Lantern Project and Brian Donlen, as treasurer, of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. On February 12, 2009, the Commission found, on the basis of the information in the complaint, and information provided by your clients, that there is no reason to believe The Lantern Project, and Brian Donlen, as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433, 434, 441a(f) and 441b(a). Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which explains the Commission's findings, is enclosed for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Shonkwiler  
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure  
Factual and Legal Analysis

29044231413

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3  
4 **RESPONDENT:** Lantern Project, and Brian Donlen, as treasurer **MUR: 5854**  
5  
6

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**  
8

9 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Commission by Democracy 21  
10 and the Campaign Legal Center. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1). The complaint alleges that the  
11 Lantern Project, an entity organized under Section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code, spent over  
12 a million dollars, raised outside the limitations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as  
13 amended, (the "Act") to influence the 2006 Senate election in Pennsylvania between Rick  
14 Santorum and Bob Casey.

15 **II. FACTUAL SUMMARY**

16 The Lantern Project was established on January 10, 2005 and files disclosure reports with  
17 the Internal Revenue Service under Section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code. 26 U.S.C. § 527.  
18 It has not registered with the Commission as a political committee. In reports filed with the IRS,  
19 it reports raising \$1,700,900 and spending \$1,633,502 through February 2007, with most of its  
20 financial activity taking place in the months immediately prior to the 2006 general election.<sup>1</sup> The  
21 complaint alleges that the Lantern Project raised funds outside the limitations and prohibitions of  
22 the Act to influence the 2006 Senate election in Pennsylvania between Rick Santorum and Bob  
23 Casey, and therefore should have registered and properly disclosed its activities in reports filed  
24 with the Commission.

---

<sup>1</sup> Almost half of the Lantern Project's receipts, \$865,500, came from labor organizations. In addition, \$697,000 of the donations received from individuals exceeded \$5,000.

29044231415

1 In response to the complaint, Lantern Project denies that it received contributions or made  
2 any expenditures for the purpose of influencing a federal election, and thus was not was required  
3 to register and report as a political committee under the Act. In asserting that it did not make any  
4 expenditures, the Lantern Project states that it did not pay for any communications containing  
5 express advocacy. Further, the organization asserts that the complaint errs by equating 527  
6 organization status with political committee status and by claiming that the organization's major  
7 purpose was the election of candidates.

8 The Lantern Project funded at least eight television advertisements, one Internet ad, and  
9 one radio ad, all of which criticized Santorum's position on an issue. Representative examples of  
10 the ads include:

- 11 ■ "It's hard to make ends meet. Yet Rick Santorum voted against raising the  
12 minimum wage. But Santorum voted to allow his own pay to be raised by \$8000.  
13 What is he thinking?" ("Minimum").
- 14  
15 ■ "From privatizing Social Security to cutting student loans for the middle class,  
16 when Rick Santorum has to choose between siding with George Bush or middle  
17 class Pennsylvanians, Santorum supports Bush. What is he thinking?" ("Sides").
- 18  
19 ■ "Rick Santorum's committees accepted more money from lobbyists last year than  
20 any other member of Congress. No wonder Santorum voted to give billions in  
21 special tax breaks to oil companies. What was he thinking?" ("Lobbyists").  
22

23 Although the complaint generally alleges that the Lantern Project accepted  
24 contributions, the complainants do not appear to have had access to any Lantern Project  
25 fundraising materials. Although Lantern Project did not submit any sample solicitations with its  
26 response, it stated that its "written solicitations ... tell donors expressly that their funds will not  
27 be used to support the election or defeat of clearly identified federal candidates." Lantern Project  
28 Response at 3 (emphasis added). Further, a review of the organization's website identified an

1 instruction to readers that: “[c]ontributions to the Lantern Project will neither be used to support  
2 or oppose the election of a clearly identified Federal candidate nor to influence Federal  
3 elections.”<sup>2</sup>

4 The mission statement on the Lantern Project’s website asserts that “our mission here is  
5 simple: [t]o shine a light on the facts about Rick Santorum’s extreme positions, failed policies  
6 and hypocritical statements – and let the facts speak for themselves.” See MUR 5854 Complaint,  
7 Exhibit B; see also [www.santorumexposed.com](http://www.santorumexposed.com). Although the Lantern Project claims on its  
8 website that its “goal is to expose right wing public officials as the extremists they are rather than  
9 the pillars of mainstream, middle-American values they claim to be,” the website focuses  
10 exclusively on Santorum, with articles, editorials, and videos critical of the Senator and his views  
11 on a wide range of issues. There is no indication that the organization did any work outside  
12 Pennsylvania in 2006. Lantern Project’s response acknowledges that it “focused initially on the  
13 legislative record” of only Santorum, but claimed that it did so because Santorum’s agenda was  
14 the “best example” of the “brand of politics” and “right-wing legislative style” they opposed and  
15 because the group was based in Pennsylvania, the state Santorum represented. Lantern Project  
16 Response at 2-3.

### 17 III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

18 The Act defines a “political committee” as any committee, club, association, or other  
19 group of persons that receives “contributions” or makes “expenditures” for the purpose of  
20 influencing a federal election that aggregate in excess of \$1,000 during a calendar year. 2 U.S.C.  
21 § 431(4)(A). To address overbreadth concerns, the Supreme Court has held that only

---

<sup>2</sup> However, the website’s fundraising page also urged donors to contribute in order to “help us expose Rick’s radical agenda.”

29044231417  
1 organizations whose major purpose is campaign activity can potentially qualify as political  
2 committees under the Act. *See, e.g., Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 79 (1976); *FEC v.*  
3 *Massachusetts Citizens for Life*, 479 U.S. 238, 262 (1986) (“*MCFL*”). The Commission has long  
4 applied the Court’s major purpose test in determining whether an organization is a “political  
5 committee” under the Act, and it interprets that test as limited to organizations whose major  
6 purpose is federal campaign activity. *See* Political Committee Status: Supplemental Explanation  
7 and Justification, 72 Fed. Reg. 5595, 5597, 5601 (Feb. 7, 2007).

8 **A. There is an Insufficient Basis to Conclude Lantern Project Has Made**  
9 **Expenditures Exceeding \$1,000**

10  
11 In determining whether an organization makes an expenditure, the Commission “analyzes  
12 whether expenditures for any of an organization’s communications made independently of a  
13 candidate constitute express advocacy either under 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a), or the broader  
14 definition at 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(b).” Supplemental Explanation and Justification, Political  
15 Committee Status, 72 Fed. Reg. 5595, 5606 (Feb. 7, 2007). Under the Commission’s  
16 regulations, a communication contains express advocacy when it uses phrases such as “vote for  
17 the President,” “re-elect your Congressman,” or “Smith for Congress,” or uses campaign slogans  
18 or words that in context have no other reasonable meaning than to urge the election or defeat of  
19 one or more clearly identified candidates, such as posters, bumper stickers, or advertisements that  
20 say, “Nixon’s the One,” “Carter ‘76,” “Reagan/Bush,” or “Mondale!” *See* 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a);  
21 *see also MCFL*, 479 U.S. at 249 (“[The publication] provides in effect an explicit directive: vote  
22 for these (named) candidates. The fact that this message is marginally less direct than “Vote for  
23 Smith” does not change its essential nature.”). Courts have held that “express advocacy also  
24 includes verbs that exhort one to campaign for, or contribute to, a clearly identified candidate.”

29044231418  
1 *FEC v. Christian Coalition*, 52 F.Supp. 2d 45, 62 (D.D.C. 1999) (explaining why *Buckley*, 424  
2 U.S. at 44, n.52, included the word “support,” in addition to “vote for” or “elect,” on its list of  
3 examples of express advocacy communication).

4 The Commission’s regulations further provide that express advocacy includes  
5 communications containing an “electoral portion” that is “unmistakable, unambiguous, and  
6 suggestive of only one meaning” and about which “reasonable minds could not differ as to  
7 whether it encourages actions to elect or defeat” a candidate when taken as a whole and with  
8 limited reference to external events, such as the proximity to the election. *See* 11 C.F.R.  
9 § 100.22(b). In its discussion of then-newly promulgated section 100.22, the Commission stated  
10 that “communications discussing or commenting on a candidate’s character, qualifications or  
11 accomplishments are considered express advocacy under new section 100.22(b) if, in context,  
12 they have no other reasonable meaning than to encourage actions to elect or defeat the candidate  
13 in question.” *See* 60 Fed. Reg. 35292, 35295 (July 6, 1995).<sup>3</sup>

14 As explained earlier, Lantern Project distributed at least ten advertisements. A review of  
15 the ads reveals that each of them is critical of Santorum, but at the same time, they focus on  
16 issues, and never mention Santorum’s candidacy or his political opponent. Finally, the ads  
17 contain no exhortations that a viewer would understand as urging action for Santorum’s election.

---

<sup>3</sup> In *FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (2007) (*WRTL*), the U.S. Supreme Court held that “an ad is the functional equivalent of express advocacy,” and thus subject to the ban against corporate funding of electioneering communications, “only if the ad is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate.” *Id.*, 127 S.Ct. at 2667. Although 11 C.F.R. § 100.22 was not at issue in the matter, the Court’s analysis included examining whether the electioneering communication had “indicia of express advocacy” such as the “mention [of] an election, candidacy, political party, or challenger” or whether it “take[s] a position on a candidate’s character, qualifications, or fitness for office.” *Id.* The Commission subsequently incorporated the principles set forth in the *WRTL* opinion into its regulations governing permissible uses of corporate and labor organization funds for electioneering communications at 11 C.F.R. § 114.15. *See* Final Rule on Electioneering Communications, 72 Fed. Reg. 72899, 72914 (Dec. 26, 2007).

20044231419

1 The ads in question do not contain phrases, slogans or words that explicitly urge the election of  
2 Rick Santorum or the defeat of Bob Casey. *See* 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a). Rather, they end with the  
3 rhetorical question asking “What was he thinking?” While the communications clearly indicate  
4 that the Lantern Project disagrees with Santorum’s policies on the various issues, it does not tell  
5 readers to vote for Santorum, and does not identify him as a candidate for the office of Senate.

6 Moreover, the communication’s electoral portion is not “unmistakable, unambiguous, and  
7 suggestive of only one meaning”; and reasonable minds could differ as to whether it encourages  
8 electoral, or some other action. *See* 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(b). While the ads appear to have been  
9 broadcast in the months preceding the general election, the overwhelming focus of the  
10 communication is on issues and Santorum’s policies or positions on those issues. Even ads that  
11 arguably attack Santorum’s “character, fitness and qualifications,” such as “Lobbyists,” where  
12 Santorum’s legislative votes are linked to lobbyist’s political contributions, do not appear to  
13 qualify as express advocacy. *See* 60 Fed. Reg. at 35295. “Lobbyists” is principally about the  
14 legislative issue of oil industry tax policy, not Santorum’s character. Given the lack of any  
15 electoral directives in the various Lantern Project ads, and taking the communication as a whole,  
16 one can reasonably view each communication as criticizing Santorum’s legislative or issues  
17 agenda, and not as encouraging voting for or against Santorum. Therefore, there is an  
18 insufficient basis on which to conclude that the Lantern Project has made expenditures exceeding  
19 \$1,000 and triggered political committee status through expenditures.

**B. There is an Insufficient Basis to Conclude Lantern Project Has Received Contributions Exceeding \$1,000**

The term "contribution" is defined to include "any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election for Federal office." 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i). Commission regulations provide that a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person in response to any communication is a contribution to the person making the communication if the communication indicates that any portion of the funds received will be used to support or oppose the election of a clearly identified Federal candidate. 11 C.F.R. § 100.57(a).

The complaint has not specifically alleged that the Lantern Project has received contributions under 11 C.F.R. § 100.57. Instead, it provides details on the donors to the Lantern Project whose contributions would be impermissible under the Act if the Lantern Project was a political committee. The complaint did not submit any Lantern Project solicitation letters or direct mail fundraising appeals. The Lantern Project response directly addresses the complaint's allegations by explaining that Lantern Project donors were "expressly" told "that their funds will not be used to support the election or defeat of clearly identified federal candidates." Lantern Project Response at 3. A similar admonition was set forth on the organization's website. Although such a disclaimer would not immunize a fundraiser from the reach of 11 C.F.R. § 100.57 if in fact the Lantern Project communications to donors "indicate[d] that any portion of the funds received will be used to support or oppose the election of a clearly identified Federal candidate," there is no evidence that Lantern Project engaged in fundraising under these



28044231421

1 provisions. 11 C.F.R. § 100.57(a).<sup>4</sup> Therefore, there is an insufficient basis on which to  
2 conclude that the Lantern Project has received contributions exceeding \$1,000 and triggered  
3 political committee status through contributions.

4 **C. Major Purpose**

5 Because the Commission concludes that the Lantern Project has not made expenditures in  
6 excess of \$1,000 and has not accepted contributions in excess of \$1,000, it is unnecessary to  
7 make a determination as to the major purpose of Lantern Project.

8 **D. Conclusion**

9 Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the Lantern Project, and Brian Donlen, as  
10 treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433, 434, 441a(f), and 441b(a) by failing to register as a political  
11 committee with the Commission; by failing to disclose its contributions and expenditures in  
12 reports filed with the Commission; by knowingly accepting contributions in excess of \$5,000;  
13 and by knowingly accepting union contributions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Lantern Project's website set forth a message urging readers to contribute to the Lantern Project to help "expose Rick's radical agenda," but this message does not appear to request contributions to elect a clearly identified candidate for federal office because there are no references to elections or elective office in the solicitation. *See Political Committee Status & Definition of Contribution: Explanation and Justification*, 69 Fed. Reg. 68056, 68057 (Nov. 23, 2004).